CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, HAYWARD

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF
THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Approved as corrected

Minutes of the meeting of March 9, 2004

Members Present: Cal Caplan, Denise Fleming, Karina Garbesi, Liz Ginno, William Langan, Julia Norton (Chair), Hank Reichman, Jeffery Seitz, Steve Ugbah, Alison Warriner, Donald Wort

Members Absent: Norma Rees

Guests: Carl Bellone, Bob Brauer, Stanley Clark, Susan Correia, Michael Lee, Michael Leung, Dick Metz, Jodi Servatius

1. Approval of the agenda
   (M/S/P) Langan/Garbesi to approve. Ugbah asked to add item #8, FAC Chair’s memo.

2. Approval of the minutes of the meetings on February 24, 2004
   Minutes will be reviewed at the next meeting.

3. Reports
   A. Report of the Chair
   - Attended the Chairs update meeting today provided by Dorian West and Pablo Arreola. Very informative and she encouraged all departmental chairs to pay attention to the legal regulations.
   - On Monday there was a good workshop about CSUH students and substance abuse/alcohol/binge drinking etc. 75% of our students don’t drink at all.

   B. Report of the President
   - Clark gave an update on distance learning; looking for cost cutting measures, $200,000 has been given to ICS to cover distance learning costs for the last few years. This year, that number was reduced to $174,000. He estimated costs for 2003/04 to be $276,000 for distance learning. Costs broke down to about $4700 per course. Clark, Parker, Charles and the deans talked about suspending distance learning for summer 2004 onwards and allocating the money proportionally to faculty positions (live instructors onsite at CCC). The Deans agreed and will be discussing this with their faculty; and unless he hears otherwise from ExCom, he will go forward and discuss this with the President. Wort asked about the feasibility of having a faculty member onsite at CCC versus Hayward and would these be t-t or lecturers? Clark responded that this would be up to the Deans. He added that Parker is looking into other ways to deliver distance learning in the future. Reichman noted that it would be good form to contact and inform the CCAC. He also commented that this might save a few lecturer positions. Seitz asked about the issue of low enrollment and canceling of the usual distance learning classes; Clark replied that all of these issues need to be reviewed and that we need to ensure that the funds are proportionately allocated. He also commented that the goal is to maximize services to students and that FTES at CCC is of concern.

4. Supplementary funding options for University Advancement (Burt)
   - Burt distributed handout regarding finding supplemental funding which would augment State funds. Burt outlined his views on making the department’s work transparent to the university community. A benchmark study of comparable CSUs productivity/investment funding of 2002-2003 was included in the handouts. CSUH is the lowest in investment in University Advancement. The reason we are so low is because we do not have an appropriate infrastructure to support gaining major gifts. Garbesi asked about the infrastructure of Dominguez Hills as their investment is not much different than ours although they raised
over $10M in outside funds. Burt responded that that could be because of a variety of reasons – infrastructure in place perhaps, luck, etc. The Special Committee on Supplementary Funding for University Advancement was formed to examine options and make recommendations for supplementary funding. The goal is to raise $14M over the next 5 years. Burt then described the pros and cons of using the assessment of endowment administration fees. UCB assesses an 8% fee to its gifts. The con is that donors want 100% of their gift to go to what they designate. This is handled by disclosure of the policy to all. The cost of administering gifts requires us to spend money to make money. Pros include that it supplements State funding, donors are accustomed to paying management fees for their own investments, and it would create a stable source of budget support for fundraising.

-Servatius noted that when she gave her report as interim Vice-President for University Advancement in 2002 that the situation was bleak. We need staff to bring in more money; the more major gifts officers you have, the more major gifts you receive. After reviewing sister campuses, the gift assessment fee approach seems most reasonable. Lee offered that most foundations that deal with taking in gifts assess a 5-8% fee, which is standard; there may be growing pains with current donors but it ought to become standard here as in other places. Ugbah asked whether or not we (ExCom?) have jurisdiction on the decision. The CSUH Education Foundation Board of Trustees and the President will have the final say. Burt wanted to receive as much input as possible. Ugbah reported that he has been involved in University Advancement for some time, and the amount of time and effort needed to go out and find donors/gifts is enormous; and although we are in hard budget times, he recommended that we aggressively go out and raise money for the University now. Ugbah urged the group to support Burt’s efforts as they are well thought out and communicated clearly. Wort asked what amount was raised as unrestricted money and Burt responded about $250,000. Brauer commented that the focus of the last two years was the capital campaign, and the important thing to remember is future fundraising. Seitz asked about how we can expect more return on our money in the department; Burt responded that the more gift officers on staff means that more money can be raised; the difference between DH and Hayward was explained by Metz in that they had two major sports arenas donated which reflects the sharp difference in investment vs. money raised. Reichman offered that the reason that this campus has such a low donor level is because we are not adequately investing and we cannot increase it with State funding; we need to obtain outside funding of the work – i.e. the assessment fee; works like student fees, but we are only asking for 5%; ties the growth of university advancement to the growth of donations (i.e. growth is linked to their work); he also remarked that he appreciated the openness and clarity of their reports. Lee offered that the lag effect of numbers makes the numbers hard to juggle and compare what money comes in; we are also not looking at general funds to support the work, and the proposed option is very transparent. Ugbah responded to Seitz that he was very appreciative of the openness of Burt’s report as it is not sugarcoated and we do not know the full situation of the other CSU’s situation.

-The Board will meet March 30th, so any feedback would be appreciated before then. We have been able to see high pay out at 5.5% above the rate of inflation. The Trustees make the decisions about investments. For the CSUH Education Foundation, the restrictions on investments are determined by tax laws (we can never go below 20% in fixed assets, etc.).
C. **Report of Statewide Senators**
   - Caplan reported that they meet this week. Two resolutions will be up for their 2nd reading: moving holocaust center to Long Beach; and raise graduate students’ fees 40%.
   - Reichman noted that the big issues will be the 45/15 transfer units and the budget.

D. **Report of ASI Representative**
   - meet tomorrow.

5. **Deadline for submissions to the 03-04 Academic Senate**
   Documents must be in the Senate Office by May 14th in order to get it to ExCom and forward to Senate in 03-04.
   (M/S/P) Langan/Garbesi to adopt the date.

6. **Elsevier discussion reopened (postponed until draft Resolution is sent by email)**
   - Norton asked that an addition to the resolution be made; that we can work this through our professional societies to encourage peer-reviewed publishing online, and encourage the societies to compete with Elsevier to open up to faculty in many venues.

7. **Chair of FAC Letter to ExCom**
   - ExCom would still value an open discussion with the chair of FAC and is still open to a meeting with the Chair, as well as other FAC members, at a Spring quarter ExCom meeting. It was agreed that a good discussion could clear up some of the inaccuracies and misperceptions that have collected of late between both bodies and restore collegiality and clear communications.

8. **Adjournment**
   (M/S/P) Langan/Ugbah at 3:51pm.

   Respectfully Submitted,

   Liz Ginno, Secretary